

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 12-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dharnipragada* (U.S. 6,490,493) in view of *Kroening et al.* (U.S. 6,080,207), further in view of *Knowles et al.* (U.S. 6,182,897).

Applicants traverse this rejection on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP §2142:

...The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. If the Examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the Applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.....the Examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made....The Examiner must put aside knowledge of the Applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole.'"

The independent claim 1 of the present invention, as amended, claims:

...the control unit controlling manufacturing and supply lines containing a plurality of compatible hardware and selected software components for installation into the computer being manufactured;

the customer entering any special configuration details to the web page unit;

passing the web page to a modification unit in the office unit;

passing the special configuration details to a validation unit in the office unit;

the validation unit checking the special configuration details for compatibility with details of the main order;

upon validation, sending the special configuration details to the control unit;

the control unit detecting any modification details in the main order details and obtaining corresponding configuration details from the modification unit;

the control unit checking the configuration details with a factory database for implementation; and

the control unit entering appropriate data into the computer being manufactured including entering modification details in appropriate ones of the selected software components which are being installed or have been installed in the computer.

There is simply no basis in the art for combining the references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection because none of the cited references teach or even suggest the desirability of the combination. Moreover, none of the cited references provide any incentive or motivation supporting the desirability of the combination.

Considering the art of record, *Dharnipragada* '493 reference is directed to building measurement instruments and valves in a "built-to-order" system managed by a software. The *Kroening et al.* '207 reference is directed to creating and delivering software. The *Knowles et al.* '897 reference is directed to a web-enabled system for designing and manufacturing laser scanners.

The present invention is directed to custom building computer systems. A web-enabled order system coordinates manufacturing supply lines to supply compatible hardware and selected software components to fill an order. The order may be specially configured and validated as to compatibility. The order is further controlled to provide modification details in the selected software components which are being installed or have been installed.

The art of record does not include or suggest all of the above capabilities.

Furthermore, the references fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention, as set forth in claim 1.

The MPEP §2143.01 provides:

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, the Examiner's combination arises solely from hindsight based on the invention without any showing of suggestion, incentive or motivation in either reference for the combination.

Thus, the Examiner's burden of factually supporting a prima facie case of obviousness has clearly not been met.

The Federal Circuit has, on many occasions, held that there was no basis for combining references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection. For example, in *In re Geiger*, the court stated in holding that the PTO "failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness":

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 15.72, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Federal Circuit has also repeatedly warned against using the Applicant's disclosure as a blueprint to reconstruct the claimed invention out of isolated teachings in the prior art. See e.g., *Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products*, 840 F.2d 902, 907, 5 USPQ2d 1798, 1792 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

More recently, the Federal Circuit found motivation absent in *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998). In this case, the court concluded that the board had "reversibly erred in determining that one of [ordinary] skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these references in a manner that rendered the claimed invention [to have been] obvious." The court noted that to "prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the Examiner to show a motivation to combine the references that create the case of obviousness." The court further noted that there were three possible sources for such motivation, namely "(1) the nature of the problem to be solved; (2) the teachings of the prior art; and (3) the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art." Here, according to the court, the board had relied simply upon "the high level of skill in the art to provide the necessary motivation," without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination. Notably, the court wrote: "If such a rote invocation could suffice to supply a motivation to combine, the more sophisticated scientific fields would rarely, if ever, experience a patentable technical advance."

Therefore, independent claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom are submitted to be allowable.


In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 12-16 and 19 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

**PATENT**

Docket: 16356.486 (DC-01916)

Customer No. 000027683

Respectfully submitted,




James R. Bell

Registration No. 26,528

Dated: 8-18-05  
HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789  
Telephone: 512/867-8407  
Facsimile: 214/200-0853  
ipdocketing@haynesboone.com

A-180830\_1.DOC

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.	
on	<u>8/18/05</u>
Date	<u></u>
Signature	<u>NISHI PARAYYA</u>
Typed or Printed name of person signing Certificate	